TERRI AGNEW:	Good morning, good afternoon, and good evening. Welcome to the LACRALO monthly teleconference taking place on Monday, 15th of August 2016, at 23:00 UTC.
	On the call today, we have Alexis Anteliz, Juan Matos, Alfredo Lopez, Maritza Aguero, Beatriz Rodriguez, Alejandro Acosta, Juan Manuel Rojas, Sergio Salinas Porto, Aida Noblia, [Javier Chandía], and Bartlett Morgan.
	Joining us a little late in the call will be Sylvia Leite Herlein. We have listed apologies from Alyne Andrade, Carlos Raúl Gutiérrez, Dev Anand Teelucksingh, Carlos Aguirre, and Harold Arcos.
	From staff, we have Silvia Vivanco and myself, Terri Agnew.
	Our Spanish interpreters today are Veronica and David. Our Portuguese interpreters are Bettina and Esperanza. Our French interpreters today are Isabelle and Claire. I would like to remind all participants to please state your name before speaking for transcription purposes and also for our interpreters.
	Also joining us on the call today in addition to the earlier mentioned names, we have Beatriz Rodriguez, Lina Ornelas, Ricardo Holmquist, Alfredo Lopez, Alberto Soto, Humberto Carrasco, Delma Rodriguez, Vanda Scartezini, and Anahi Mendez.
	With that, I'd like to thank everyone for joining and turn it back over to begin.

HUMBERTO CARRASCO: Thank you very much. Maritza, if you could please start with our agenda, I give the floor.

MARITZA AGUERO: Thank you, Humberto. Can you please confirm you can hear me?

HUMBERTO CARRASCO: We can hear you nicely.

MARITZA AGUERO: Thank you very much. We will start this call today with a presentation by Ornelas. She is a head of public policy and relations with the government for Google. She will talk about the defense of liberties on the Internet, what are the possible impacts of this in Latin America.

Then we will hear Mr. Alejandro Acosta from LACNIC. He will talk about the RPKI, the resources numbers assigned in the region.

We will finalize this presentation with the most impactful issues that [are] within LACIGF9 by Beatriz Rodriguez. She is a Board member of ISOC in the Uruguay chapter.

To sum up, we will deal with other issues in this call.

I will now give the floor again to Humberto.

HUMBERTO CARRASCO: Thank you very much, Maritza. The agenda then is adopted. We will now go to Item 4. This means that we are going to hear a presentation on the defense of rights and liberties on the Internet, Google's challenges in Latin America. This will be a presentation by Lina Ornelas. Thank you very much, Lina, for being here.

LINA ORNELAS: Thank you very much for the invitation to speak at LACRALO. Also, I would like to thank Maritza Aguero. It's an honor for me to be here today.

I just want to confirm how much time I have for this presentation so that I don't go on, on your agenda. Is it 15 minutes? This is what I was told.

MARITZA AGUERO: It's 15 minutes is the maximum time you have assigned.

LINA ORNELAS: I would like to share with you three issues that are impactful for Google. We would like to share our experience in Latin America with respect to a very specific case that has been called "the right to be forgotten" in Europe. We believe this is more of an academic construction. We will see how it is that Latin America has resolved this issue through the Supreme Court in the different places.

Google's view is to protect the rights and liberties on the Internet for all of our users. As you know, our mission is to organize the world's

information and to put it at the disposal of everybody. In this sense, freedom of speech is one of our pillars. As you know, our search engine simply reflects what is already existing in web pages where editors and people upload the information.

Privacy is also very important for Google. I would like to say here that the information that our users leave in the web pages is something that we protect with a very, very high security. Online security for our users is something that we devote a lot of time to, and we also devote a lot of engineering for this to work nicely. But this is different from speaking about the role of Google as an intermediary. That is, as a platform on which we run third-party content.

And so I would like to focus on what has happened in Europe on the right to be forgotten. We believe this is not a good name because it is not eliminating information in the original websites, but actually search engines as intermediaries are asked under a resolution – well, there was a case in the European [inaudible] that simply considered that people have a right to remove information from search without including their names. This is so in the case that they are considered irrelevant.

Civil society is very concerned about this. The same happens with the media and with editors because it's not judges who are the ones who will determine whether these rights are affected or not. It's not the judges determining that personal information is appearing on the search engine, but actually it's a private company that is deciding this. So it's privatizing justice.

So Google needs to wait in each case if there is a public interest or if this information is actually not relevant. As you can imagine, this is very ambiguous. The European court did not give any more clues on how we should interpret that something is excessive or insufficient, and so the court has raised many practical questions for us.

On the day after that Google saw this judgment, we of course enforced it. We've met with a very big team of lawyers to review whether this information needs to be eliminated or removed online on a case-by-case basis.

Because there is no clarity, Google created an advisory council and this advisory council provided a few guidelines on how we should solve these cases because we actually feel that we have a very big responsibility and we want to comply with the regulations.

Now I want to share a very serious problem with you. There are some effects that were not considered when the judgment was issued, and [this is so] because the court is telling us among other things that we should not tell editors when some information is being removed.

Also, we are seeing new interpretations on whether this removal of information needs to include the national domain where the person that asked for the right to be forgotten is living according to European law. This law has been in effect for more than 20 years when the resolution was issued. So the question is whether it should be removed from the .com or also from the .it or .cr. That is, it invades the sovereignty of other countries because we may see that there is a

country that has more restrictions in terms of freedom of speech and so this information may not be known.

As we know, there may be individuals who are not people that are public personalities and we may be dealing with an entrepreneur who is committing fraud and he is asking that his information be removed and he could be in the future a candidate for future elections in his area. So the general lawyers in Europe had a different view because they were saying that search engines are not responsible for the way in which data is being treated.

I just want to give you some figures that concern us because of what has happened in Europe. We have received more than half a million requests for deindexation. That is, we are being requested to deindex information. We have also received requests from more than 134,000 websites, and so in Europe there is less and less access to information.

What I want to say in this second part in my last five minutes is to refer to what has happened in Latin America. Latin America has resolved this issue differently from what Europe has done because we have inter-American human rights that are very different. It clearly establishes that there may be no prior censorship to remove content, especially the Inter-American Commission on Human Rights in Article 13 very clearly establishes this.

We have also seen a joint declaration on freedom of speech on the Internet, which is very important because it was issued together with the UN and the OAS, which includes the Caribbean and also some African countries. They state there that in freedom of speech, we apply

the same regulations to the Internet that we apply to other areas. So these may also be [weighted] so that access to information is not impacted so strongly so that there is control on the content created by users.

At the same time, we have also seen some very interesting resolutions like the Colombian Supreme Court resolved an issue, a case against the newspaper El Tiempo where they say that actually we need to add information to clarify. If a person has been subjected to a court case, probably the newspaper needs to add information instead of removing it.

The rapporteur [inaudible] in Colombia established that for Latin America it was an insult to talk about the right to be forgotten when we actually have a right to know after so many authoritarian regimes we suffered in the region, and maybe we should look to other solutions that do not confuse data protection and database protection when the company responsible for this should not be the one stated initially.

The case in Colombia is very interesting because they do ask the website to clarify this information and to deindex it, but they do not ask this from a private company. In other words, Google does not want to be the big censor of content around the world.

To wrap up, I would like to refer to the negative effects of the right to be forgotten in our region. It would be ideal to avoid them. For example, there are some newspapers and blogs in Mexico that are being practically threatened by law firms. Some Spaniard law firms that arrived in Mexico are telling them that if they do not remove certain

pieces of news defaming their clients, they will be subject to fines by the authorities in Mexico.

Because there was a case in Mexico – a very widely criticized case – where a person who committed fraud was requesting to remove information, and so the information in the end was deindexed. So the media in Mexico are now being subject to many pressures, and many of them do remove those contents because they do not have legal areas to address these issues so we are losing a lot of information. What's even more serious is that many of these clients are people who are committing fraud or who have an ominous past.

This is all very delicate. We are glad that in Latin America the judges and the different courts and even Supreme Courts are considering this. We are seeing this in very high parts of our legal pyramid. We need to see if we are going to deindex this information or not.

Finally, the global removal of information, there is a very strong pressure in France where they are requesting that a French citizen can remove their name and last name, even if it is outside the French domain. There was a very resounding case in Mexico that included corruption in the Mexican government because a so-called kidnapper in a case called [inaudible] was very well-known in Mexico because they never really clarified what was the relationship between the public security secretary and another person where they included a kidnapper.

The court finally determined in Mexico that it was a due process issue because it was not really clarified. So they didn't really say in Mexico whether she was part of the kidnappers [ban], but nowadays this

person could ask under this resolution of the European court [objective] the right to be forgotten so that when she writes her name or last name, there is no information connected to her past.

France would like this to be removed from the global arena, but I as a Mexican citizen do want to know what happened with that person. I want this information to remain there, and I want to know what are these cases of corruption where these public servants were included.

So we need to protect the rights, but finally an American company we believe is not the best option to privatize justice. In Latin America, judges are the ones who should give an answer to this. So Google is willing in those cases where there is no lawful case, Google is willing to deindex this information.

We do deindex information on images related to child sexual abuse. We also do this when there is personal information on a driving license or a Social Security number or a passport number, but these are unlawful cases. This is not a gray area where a person believes that this information is damaging their prestige. Actually, we are dealing with a decision that needs to be made by a judge.

Once again, thank you very much for this information. If so, we can continue talking, but I think my time is over now. So my 15 minutes have been covered.

HUMBERTO CARRASCO: Thank you very much. I am really interested in this topic because I am working on that. Is there any question on the list?

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: I have a question.

HUMBERTO CARRASCO: I would like to give the floor to Fatima, because she has a question for [Lina]. The question is, "What happens when there is a request for the right to be forgotten? How the balance should be placed for the particular case of Google?"

Then I see Alejandro Pisanty who would like to make a question.

ALEJANDRO PISANTY: Can you hear me, Humberto?

HUMBERTO CARRASCO: Yes. Go ahead, please.

ALEJANDRO PISANTY: Lina, first of all, thank you very much for your great presentation. It was very clear, very brief, and very complete. I believe that there are different cases where the right to be forgotten applies, especially for the browsers. The reason for this reports are, in fact, reputation topics because in many cases there is no personal information related. So this is public information involved. The same applies to other cases. I believe we need to start working on this topic because this is something important.

HUMBERTO CARRASCO: There are other questions?

BEATRIZ RODRIGUEZ: The right to be forgotten (for Lina) is it a new right, or can we say that this is the equivalent for the right of suppression?

HUMBERTO CARRASCO: After you reply, Lina, I will pose another question.

LINA ORNELAS: I will start by replying to the first question, and this is how we [weight] this topic. As I said at the very beginning, after the sentence, we created specialized teams because the European court only replied [to] a specific question.

So the question made to the Luxembourg court was this: If the European legislation was applied, for example someone was requesting his or her name to be released from Internet or to disappear from Internet, well as Alejandro Pisanty said this has a different nature because in this case we are dealing with databases and there is a responsible person there and there are privacy notices. This person in charge is also managing different information. This was extrapolated through an intermediary who was not the one recollecting the original information.

For example, media was publishing information, was publishing private information that has to do with the reputation of an individual, and this information is being replicated so these are the ones responsible. But the question is how Google determines the public interest. Since there are no other criteria by the court, we went to the advisory committee. You can see this on the Google web page. Discussions were very transparent, were quite clear.

The discussions were made all around the European cities to see a way out for Google or some guidelines for Google. The conclusions were really very useful because the advice of this advisory body was really important for us. This helped us a lot.

Secondly, the working group for Section 29, as you know, the European regulation has a special section for the creation of a working group to interpret the regulation, so this was very interesting. So this working group helped Google to resolve this issue. So we were a kind of court. We were acting as a court and I will provide that information if you want to see the report.

So what we did was to take into account those criteria provided by the advisory body and also by, for example, some other people which is the director of Wikipedia or some other people. So that is how we assess our criteria. And in the report, you will see case by case, how each case was resolved. So you can see that information there.

And when it comes to Alejandro's comment, we don't have to mistake public information and information provided by the media. So in that case, the legislation and regulation should have been applied. And there

are certain risks in our region and we need new regulations to be able to cover these issues affecting intermediaries. And as Alejandro said, we are not talking about typical users, most of the time. Take Google, because of efficiency and the algorithm that is to find information and this is being improved with the passing of time.

So I believe that this type of regulation that might comply to the elimination or the removal of information in Internet [wealth] might affect the functioning. So we don't have to confuse the topics.

And when it comes to the third topic, the right to be forgotten does not exist as [touched], not even in the European court on the European regulation. So this is similar or this is equivalent to the right of cancelation or the right to eliminate or remove information.

But as you know, when we say "indexed," that does not mean to remove information and sometimes people use the term "browser" as a synonym for Internet and this is not correct. Someone may be sending spam information and may be sending certain information. And for these types of cases, it is not right to be forgotten that may be applied. So this is something serious to take into account because we are not providing any indemnification or any compensation to the individual.

So I believe we should take into account this topic. We should analyze all the cases and take into account everything that we have.

HUMBERTO CARRASCO: Thank you very much. I would like to make a comment. There is a case in Chile. You know the Supreme Court at the beginning of this year took

EN

into account a regulation by the European Union and the right to be forgotten was recognized. That is to say that if information that cannot be published and the browsers should remove information that has been published more than ten years ago. So this is a very particular case.

My last comment is this. We need to be careful with European regulation and especially with French regulation because I remember that some time ago, Yahoo published certain information and the European government asked them to remove that information and the American court was in favor of Yahoo. But when the directors of Yahoo went to France, well, they were sent to jail.

LINA ORNELAS: Well, you know, this topic and this issue of the [NASI] issue or the [NASI] thing, well, this has to do with human rights. So this goes beyond the sovereignty of each state.

HUMBERTO CARRASCO: Well, they had to remove that information from the Internet so this is somehow in favor of them.

LINA ORNELAS: Humberto, when there is something which is something that is important in Chile and this is that we have different resolutions. There was a judgment by the court in October 2015 and this covers a report by someone. And in that resolution, it was requested to remove information about certain accusations or certain problems. So in that

EN

case, the Appalachian court decided not to call the directors of the browser to go to jail. But this is how the court operates and in that case, they decided to remove the information from the Internet. But we have a set of criteria to be applied.

And the thing is that countries should start thinking about the future because the court in Lutzembourg issued a resolution supplementing other resolutions and it was established that the browser is just an intermediary tool. And this, of course, changed the points of view.

So I believe that each country should pay attention to it through and see the adequate model to follow. We have been discussing and fighting for this right, the right to access information, and perhaps, we should avoid any misunderstanding in this topic because in the future, this might be of public interest as well.

Even historians are also paying attention to these because this would be impacting history. So we have to think about the model and we have to think about the future.

HUMBERTO CARRASCO: Thank you very much. You know time is ticking so we won't keep on discussing this topic. I believe this is very interesting. I see many comments on the chat, so perhaps, we might repeat this topic in the future. So once again, thank you very much for your participation.

LINA ORNELAS: Thank you, Humberto. Thank you for the invitation.

HUMBERTO CARRASCO: So now let's go to item number five on the agenda. In this case, we will be speaking about the certification system for the number of resources. This presentation will be delivered by Alejandro Acosta. Alejandro, you have 15 minutes for your presentation. So Alejandro, go ahead, please. You have the floor.

Alejandro, are you there? Can you please confirm Alejandro is online?

TERRI AGNEW: Alejandro, I see that your mic is active.

SILVIA VIVANCO: Yes.

HUMBERTO CARRASCO: Is Alejandro connected? If not, I can give the floor to Beatriz Rodriguez. first.

SILVIA VIVANCO: Well, I am being told that he is not connected so perhaps we can give the floor to Beatriz Rodriguez and then we can give the floor to Alejandro.

ALEJANDRO ACOSTA: Hello. I had a problem with my audio but now I'm okay, so I hope you can hear me. I was listening to Lina, so Lina, thank you very much for

your presentation. It was a really good one. I hope not to be so boring with this presentation which is very technical, indeed.

You see a presentation in front of you, right?

HUMBERTO CARRASCO: Yes, we do.

ALEJANDRO ACOSTA: So this is the first time I will be delivering this presentation in ten minutes. So basically, I want to summarize this issue of the RPKI. As you can see, this is a resource public key infrastructure for Internet numbers. So basically, this is the same concept that we already know. RPKI stands for Resource Public Key Infrastructure and we, of course, speak about Internet. We speak about numbers. So as I said before, RPKI means Resource Public Key Infrastructure.

In order to understand this issue, it is important to see the map. You know we have the RIRs which are the Internet registries. We have the LACNIC for Latin America, APNIC for Asia Pacific, ARIN for North America, RIPE for Europe. So this is just for you to take into account.

I know that most of you know this, but the RIRs basically store information. This is important because the idea is that you can link all the information that you can see in the presentation with the concepts that you have. So as I said before, the RPKI structure is hierarchical. We have the IANA, we have Internet resources, we have IPv6 and IPv4, and the RIRs are the ones storing all this information.

Now I want to make a point of clarification. This is not a problem. What we'll do right now is to try to take into account the RPKI and, for example, if we have a network in Chile, this network should be used in Chile and not in Spain or in China. And this was a problem for Internet. This is something constantly happening, probably on a weekly basis. We have been having any problems such as hijacking. The most important topic is, for example, in Latin America, we had hijacking cases. We have, for example, problems with Google. So this is happening, but we are trying to minimize all this impact.

Now, in order to understand how this works, we need to understand the Internet functioning. We have the BGP, so we have the routers. And BGP stands for Border Gateway Protocol. This is a network. In order for a network to get to France, for example, we need the BGP. So we have to take into account the suppliers and we have to take into account the protocols as well.

Here we have an example of a BGP. We have four messages and in this case, the router which is on the right, which is AS300, is delivering the message to a router and that other router is delivering the message to another router and this goes on until the message is delivered. This is how Internet works.

So that router may be delivering the right message or may be delivering a wrong message or a message which is false, or perhaps maybe you're seeing a wrong number. It might be a mistake, but this is how it works.

So what happens when routers need to keep on working? For example, if sometime in the future I would like to create a network and I am

creating that network with Maritza, I will use a router but perhaps, in the future, there might be a problem with Maritza's network. So this is important to take into account because we have to use digital certificates. Basically, a digital certificate is a plain text file, for example, a TXT5 containing a great amount of information.

So with this information, we will create the routing tables in Internet. Here we see an example. For example, a route hijacking. In this case, we have the network called AS607057. So this number announces a network which is 24016, but at a point in time, the router in red begins to announce a part of this network. This is a specific network and what happens here is that the router on the left, when this router wants to reach the specific network will go to the red network. And it will get another type of information.

Unfortunately, the picture in red or the router in red is deviating information and this may happen. For example, this may be the case of a bank or a financial institution. And in this case, the information will be wrong. So what happens with the RPKI? Well, it gets interaction. In Latin America, this is being applied. Twenty percent of the traffic is [find] in Latin America and we have insured networks properly.

How this works? Well, basically on the right, you see Internet and on the left, you see, for example, the ISP. The router on the left which is the white drawing with red arrows supports the RPKI. It will validate information. This will be done on a separate device because there are many resources inside and basically, the router will ask according to the information being received. For example, the router will say, "I have this

EN

piece of information, so what should I do with this information?" And the RPKI will validate that information.

If it is validated, it means that it is a secure network and this information with that network should be announced in the autonomous system, number one, for example. If it is invalid, if the information is not valid, well, the network will be announced in the autonomous system number one, but the information will also be sent to the autonomous system number two. But in this case, it is something which is wrong. And this is because the network was not secured. So this is technical information.

We use the ROA, so this is a Route Origin Authorization. We have plain text with a specific format which is already signed. In this case, we have the ASM, the IP block. That is an initial validation, a validity date. I know this date will be announced by the autonomous system, for example, 2015 until 2018, and that will be taken into account. There is an ROA created for each ASM, so this means that for each ASM, there will be an ROA.

I don't know if there are any questions. If that is the case, I'm open to receive questions.

HUMBERTO CARRASCO: Thank you very much.

ALEJANDRO ACOSTA: There seems there is a question by Alejandro, by Raitme Citterio.

HUMBERTO CARRASCO:	If you're reading the AC room, maybe you can answer to what you're asking there.

ALEJANDRO ACOSTA:	Yes, I am actually reading this room chat. So I'm going to start with the question by Raitme Citterio. He's asking, "Can RPKI be used to certify resources within dedicators of private networks?"

Well, it's a rather complex answer. We are always talking about ensuring global Internet resources. We are not really referring to a LAT network and to RPKI certificates. Well, actually, Raitme, technically, this is feasible. You can do this with a certifying unit to create a certificate. So it is possible, but actually, I think this is going to be a bit difficult. In our LAT network, I was not using, but RPKI is a standard. It's standardized by IETF. It has the proper documentation, external documentation.

And when I said that Ecuador, Costa Rica, and Venezuela have a very high penetration index in RPKI, this is because Ecuador has a document – if I'm not mistaken, there is a working group for routing – where they discuss their experience in implementing RPKI. So basically, this was done by Ecuador because they were the first ones to have such high value. They were at 99% of all the certificates being signed. Their case is very, very significant.

HUMBERTO CARRASCO:	I think Alejandro Pisanty would like to ask a question, so Alejandro, now you have the floor.

ALEJANDRO PISANTY: Alejandro, thank you very much for this very nice presentation. As you know, At-Large organizations are very committed to the interests of Internet users not only in domain names, but also in cases like the one you are presenting in whatever concerns IP allocation. So what would be the most relevant activity for us with this kind of organizations to support RPKI?

ALEJANDRO ACOSTA: Thank you for your question. In LACNIC we've done something that's been very fruitful and we would love – and I emphasize – we'd love to repeat this experience. What we do is we have an entity – and the ALSes are a good way to do this – and what we do is invite ISPs to meetings, to classrooms, to a lab, to university classrooms, or wherever, and we probably give an RPKI course – an eight-hour course or a four-hour course – and then by the end of the day we create the ROAs for the ISPs with LACNIC's support.

There is someone who knows a lot about this and we go together with the ISPs and we help them create the ROAs. It is a very, very, good method and we have a lot of experience with that and we've done very nicely. So I invite whoever wants to come. We just ask the local host – the ALS or the local entity – to support us with invites to the different organizations.

ALEJANDRO PISANTY:	Thank you very much. What are the incentives or the resistances that you actually find and that we can help provide?
LEJANDRO ACOSTA:	I dare say I work with two strong technologies. One is IPv6 and the other one is RPKI. With RPKI we haven't really had major resistances or major problems basically because it's very implementable, at least to create the ROAs. The document that's raised with the autonomous system needs to be announced or that it has to announce certain networks, well, we've had very good feedback for that.
	And I'm going to explain why it is very good. We just have a web page with LACNIC credentials and you access with a user and a password and in less than 10 or 15 minutes you can already get the certificate created. It's very, very, easy and there is a very minimal resistance path. We need some more support and some more training because it's a relatively new technology and we need to educate on that. And I would like to thank LACRALO and especially Maritza for this invitation, but we haven't really had important obstacles because this is really very, very, easy.
HUMBERTO CARRASCO:	There is a last question. You said that there are three countries that have implemented this system in Latin America.
ALEJANDRO ACOSTA:	Well maybe I just wasn't right. There actually are three countries that have a record, because they have 90% of their resources signed. The

EN

rest of the countries also do have a very high penetration of RPKI, perhaps not as much as these three specific countries. Maybe at some other time we can focus on which are those countries and maybe it would be a good idea to have a look at the creation of ROAs and maybe we can [start by] these countries. I will be glad to make this research and to bring this to LACRALO or to Maritza.

HUMBERTO CARRASCO: Thank you, Alejandro. We are about to end our time. We are very happy with the very good quality of your presentation and thank you very much for being here. Thank you for having accepted this invitation to be more involved in LACRALO.

I apologize because my kids are here and they are screaming around.

So we will now go to Item #6. This presentation will be by Beatriz Rodriguez. She is the member of the ISOC Board in the [Euro-wide] chapter.

Beatriz, you will also have ten minutes for your presentation and then five minutes for questions. You have the floor now, Beatriz.

BEATRIZ RODRIGUEZ: Thank you very much for this invitation first of all. I see a lot of people are now connected. Many of them I do know and many of them have also been involved together with me on the ALAC IGF9, so if there is something missing or if I forget something, please do help me bring this to all of you.

When the LACIGF was held now in Costa Rica on the 27th until the 29th of July, many of the people that I've talked to at that time told me that one of the things that catches their eye is that the format in this case has changed and the panels were not made up only of people who had a lot of experience in different issues, but actually they also involved participants who wanted to take the floor and there was a feedback between them. So it was not only listening to the panelists to the speakers in the panels, but actually participants could take the floor and speak.

And so we saw that there was a certain positioning with a recognition to everything related to young people and to the work and the involvement of women on the Internet ecosystem. In many of the countries we didn't only see that involvement, that participation, but also behind the panel we saw many young people and we saw them very strongly there.

There were 10 panels and so we could see that both human rights and Internet neutrality and zero rating, all those were issues being dealt with not only by the panel but also by other panels where you would see that the same issues arose. So what we see is that the Internet should not only be focused as something technical or as something that is actually an area where people are included in that Internet. And so people try to protect their human rights.

There is a new billion people who want to connect to the Internet and we want to involve them. So with respect to this new connection, we heard some interesting interventions because if we connect that billion people, is the quality that we're going to give them going to be better?

Is it going to be the same? Will that connection be the same for everybody? Will they have different speeds and different costs? These were some of the questions asked when participants got involved with the new connections for these new people to reach the second billion.

Another thing we saw on LACIGF was a strong focus on security. All these new issues emerging in connection with security problems, not only at the technical level but also at the level of people when there are different crimes that may be committed using the Internet, and people are the ones that are being affected by this. So it's not only the technical part but it's also people.

Another issue dealt with was the format of the sessions. There was a panel on the future on the governance of the meeting, and so what the community saw was how participation mechanisms can be changed, how can a scholarship be given, how can you choose the people in each panel? And so all of that leads us to believe that the community is increasingly interested in Internet governance. And so one of the issues that we need to consider is that the format for the next IGF, the global IGF, that will be held in Mexico, it seems that there are some innovative formats being implemented in IGF sessions.

This is more or less a summary of what we saw during those minutes. There's still a lot to be done. There's more stuff to be done each time, and we see there are new issues emerging and these are not only technical issues but there are also issues related to human rights and co-existence between the different communities.

Can you tell me if I have more time or maybe if there are some questions that you want to ask?

HUMBERTO CARRASCO: I think the time is okay. I now open the floor for questions. I see people typing on the AC room. So let's wait until we see questions asked there before I give the floor. Still if you want to raise your hands, go ahead, or if there is someone who would like to ask anything else you can speak now.

Well, it seems there are no comments and no questions.

ALEJANDRO PISANTY: There is a written question.

This is [inaudible] speaking. I am phrasing the question now.

Alejandro is asking about the issues related to LACRALO. He wants to know if there was any comments related to that.

BEATRIZ RODRIGUEZ: Well, the issues related to Latin America and the Caribbean are the issues that were dealt in each of the panels. Actually what we need to consider is that there is a participation of all of us as a community in itself and not to try and see if we can implement a way to work together. So maybe in this way we can stop having certain cases for certain regions and others for different regions, and to try to continue in everything that is related to the Internet and to the network in general.

HUMBERTO CARRASCO: I think Alfredo Lopez is also asking a question.

Alfredo Lopez is asking if you discussed something about the deep web.

BEATRIZ RODRIGUEZ: When we talked about security, we heard some discussions on surveillance and privacy itself. There were also some discussions on focusing on – how to say this – all these new crimes now emerging within the web. I can't really recall having heard something about the deep web specifically, but maybe they discuss it at some panel, maybe Alejandro can remember something about this or some other of the girls, Anahi or Fatima who were also there. But I can't really recall this being discussed.

ALEJANDRO PISANTY: with respect to cybercrime, maybe the most important new message – including the deep web because this is not an Internet governance issue – but with respect to cybercrime, probably the most noticeable is there are more and more participants saying that we need to focus on crime and not on the cyber part. So we need to focus on rules, regulations, behaviors, and not so much on technical tools that evolve much faster than the intention of criminals.

And then with respect to ICANN, I echo what Beatriz has said. There weren't really issues related to domain names, IP management, etc. with relevance for LACIGF because these issues are not a controversy any longer.

BEATRIZ RODRIGUEZ: I totally agree with that.

HUMBERTO CARRASCO: I now open the floor for the last time. I remind you to raise your hand or to start speaking if you so wish. I think Aida Noblia is raising her hand. Aida, you now have the floor.

AIDA NOBLIA: I just want to say that we have a planned event for the 30th and 31st of August, and I was specifically interested on the Internet and the new role for the community. I want to convey this here and I want to inform the community on the network and protocols, the [multisectorial] governance model, domain names security, these are some of the issues that are going to be dealt with on that meeting, constructive systems, the systems in ICANN. And we also called upon different sectors, even some of them we do see some of the speakers around here. We also invited ISPs, academia, and the community in general, and even [ISG] which is the Information Society Governing Agency. And we want to involve our community, involve more people who have some knowledge about that. This was just an announcement I wanted to make.

HUMBERTO CARRASCO: Thank you very much for your notice, and thank you, Beatriz, for your presentation. This is the end of Item #6. And let's now go to the last issue on this agenda. I now open the floor if you want to take it.

EN

BEATRIZ RODRIGUEZ: Before you continue, thank you very much for the invitation.

HUMBERTO CARRASCO: You're welcome. There is something I would like to mention and this has to do with the mediation process. Many of the people who have been interviewed – interviews have already been carried out – I will have a personal interview on Wednesday with one of the mediators, but I know that many people have been interviewed and they were able to provide or to give their concerns and to speak with the mediator.

Yes, that topic you are mention is pending and I will inform you later. I see Alejandro Pisanty, he has a question. So Alejandro, you have the floor. Go ahead, please.

ALEJANDRO PISANTY: When are we going to start with the policy issues and which are these policy issues?

HUMBERTO CARRASCO: Sorry, are you referring to the LACRALO meeting, to any other meeting? Would you like to clarify that please?

Okay, thank you very much, Alejandro. We will do a survey. What we are doing right now is this – we are inviting people to participate and we are dealing with topics that might have certain impact on the end users in the regions. There are several issues that are being discussed in

ICANN and, of course, we will be delivering a survey to ask people which are the topics that they would like to see on the meetings. And, Alejandro, people are the ones choosing the topics, and this will be done through a survey that we will be preparing soon.

I would like also to mention that we have been very focused on the mediation process and, of course, as you know this is a very important topic and that's why we are not working on a normal basis. We are working very hard. So we would like to work in a different way but, of course, we do not have people so we need further resources. Anyway, we will do a survey.

I see Fatima typing. She says, "LACRALO has a mission within ICANN." And that's true, that is what we are doing and what we are trying to do.

Alejandro is also typing and he says, "We mentioned different topics in our previous meeting." And, of course, that's true. There are many topics being discussed and there are some other topics that are still pending. So, Alejandro, I kindly invite you to provide a presentation of those topics so that we can include those topics on the survey. Or perhaps you would like us to devote our self only to the survey.

Is there any other question or any other comment?

SILVIA VIVANCO: I want to make a point of clarification. I have already posted a link with the questions for public comment, so please I will kindly ask you to review your calendars for ALAC meeting and the ALT meeting. These public consultations have been discussed there, so this is for your

information and for all the participants who would like to get further information on public consultation, that's the link.

Thank you. That's all.

HUMBERTO CARRASCO: Thank you very much, Silvia. Okay, I open the floor for questions and comments.

Fatima, just to reply to you. Yes, we will deal with this topic. We will do a survey. We will need to see what the topics are, and we will be presenting that information so the idea is that in our next call you can provide us with information about the topics. And of course we will be dealing with topics that are of interest for the region as well.

ALEJANDRO PISANTY: Well, I will be drafting a report that will be ready for the next meeting.

HUMBERTO CARRASCO: That is what I'm saying, Alejandro. We will be preparing a survey asking people the topics of interest. We will be asking questions to end users and LACRALO members. That is our mandate.

Okay, if there is any other question or item or topic which is pending, we can use our [mailing] list. If there are no further questions I would like to thank you all for your participation and goodbye.

TERRI AGNEW: Once again, the meeting has been adjourned. Thank you very much for joining. Please remember to disconnect all remaining lines and have a wonderful rest of your day.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]